

REMARKS

In the official action of March 12, 2004, the Examiner allowed Claims 5, 10 and 13 – 18, and rejected the remaining claims under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kaish U.S. Patent 4,494,114. For reasons to be discussed below, it is believed that the original claims clearly distinguished over that reference, which, incidentally, was included among the references cited in the discussion of the Background of the Invention in the present application (page 2); nevertheless, these claims have been amended in order to more clearly define the present invention. In addition, the specification has been amended merely to conform the introductory portion to the language now used in the claims.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in the light of these amendments and the following remarks.

A basic difference in the invention of the present application over that in the cited Kaish patent is that the method and system of the Kaish patent are user-sensitive, whereas in the present application they are location-sensitive.

Thus, the Kaish patent includes a keypad (26) which must be operated by the user in order to operate the electrical equipment being secured. As described in the patent (e.g., column 9, lines 23 – 40 and column 10, lines 16 – 22), the user must enter a secret code via the keypad in order to operate the equipment. The equipment is normally disabled, but is enabled for operation only upon the entry of the proper code. Such a user-sensitive system, therefore, discourages theft since a thief would not know the secret code to be entered to enable operation of the equipment, and therefore

would have no incentive to steal something that would be useless to anyone who would not know, or be able to find out, the secret code.

On the other hand, Applicant's method and system are location-sensitive rather than user-sensitive. Thus, the mere removal of the electrical device from the body in which it is normally installed automatically disables the operation of the electrical device. Applicant's method and system, therefore, do not require the user to enter a code each time the device is to be used, as required in Kaish.

A location-sensitive security arrangement as in Applicant's invention has a number of important advantages over a user-sensitive security arrangement as in Kaish. For one thing, a location-sensitive system frees the legitimate user from having to memorize a secret code, and the need to re-code the security system if the user should forget the secret code. Moreover, it frees the user from the additional time and effort involved in inputting the secret code each time the equipment is to be operated.

The foregoing advantages are particularly important when the electrical device to be secured is a controller in a vehicle refueling system, which represents the preferred embodiment of the invention described in the present application. It will be appreciated, however, that such advantages are also applicable with respect to other types of electrical devices, for example to secure vehicle radios and other electrical equipment against theft.

Claim 1 has been amended in order to more sharply bring out the foregoing features and advantages of the present invention. It is submitted, therefore, that Claim 1 is also allowable over the cited reference.

Claims 2 – 4 and 6 all depend from Claim 1, and are therefore believed allowable with that claim apart from the further features added in the respective dependent claims.

Claim 7 has also been amended to bring out the foregoing features, and is therefore believed allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 both depend from Claim 7, and are therefore believed to be allowable with that claim, apart from the further features added in the respective dependent claims.

Claim 11 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice, and Claim 13 has been redrafted as an independent claim. Since Claim 13 was indicated as allowable in the preceding official action, it is assumed that Claim 13, as now amended, is also allowable.

The remaining rejected Claims 19 and 20 both depend from Claim 13, and are therefore believed to be allowable with that claim for the same reasons, in addition to the further features added in the respective dependent claims.

As indicated earlier, the specification has been amended merely to conform the introductory portion to the language now used in the claims.

The newly-submitted drawings are believed to avoid all the objections raised by the Examiner in the originally-submitted drawings.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Sol Sheinbein
Registration No. 25,457

Date: June 8, 2004